

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants have received the Office Action dated April 10, 2007, in which the Examiner rejected claims 1-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Constien (U.S. Pat. No. 6,259,932, hereinafter "Constien") in view of Ditzik (U.S. Pat. No. 5,983,073, hereinafter "Ditzik"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections for the following reasons, and request reconsideration and allowance of this case.

Claim 1 requires that the display have an external casing "in which a plurality of externally exposed recessed cavities are provided" in which a radio module and an antenna module are received. The Examiner acknowledged that Constien does not disclose such a display, that is, a display having a casing with a plurality of externally exposed recessed cavities into which a radio and an antenna module are received. Instead, for this teaching, the Examiner turned to Ditzik Figs 3-6 and col. 6.

At col. 6, lines 12-14, Ditzik teaches that "a wireless RF transceiver and modem may be located in the flat display panel assembly 2 for voice or data communications." This teaching of Ditzik does not mean, however, that the transceiver and modem are located in an "externally exposed recessed cavity" of the display panel. Other references in Ditzik to the location of the modem¹ are as follows:

- "For portability reasons, it is desirable that the modem or digital terminal adapter be built into the computer system unit." Col. 6, lines 35-37.
- "The housing section 8 may include a wireless modem or communications adapter means." Col. 7, lines 5-7.
- "The notebook computer unit may have a plurality of electrical connectors along the edges or other convenient locations for connection to a plurality of external devices, including but not limited to: modems, network interface cards, hard disks, floppy disks, and bus extender enclosures." Col. 10, lines 5-10.

None of these references teach or even suggest that the modem is located in an externally exposed recessed cavity of the display. For at least this reason,

¹ Applicants do not concede that Ditzik's modem is the claimed "radio module."


Appl. No. 10/034,224
Amdt. dated May 30, 2007
Reply to Office Action of April 10, 2007

Applicants contend that claim 1 and claims dependent thereon are allowable over the cited art.

The same or similar reasons apply to claims 12-23 as well. In addition, claim 12 is directed to a display into which a radio module can be "removably inserted" into an externally exposed recessed cavity. The Examiner acknowledged that Constien lacks such a teaching. Applicants respectfully submit that Ditzik also lacks such a teaching. In fact, as noted above, Ditzik teaches that "it is desirable that the modem...adapter be built into the computer system unit." This statement is suggestive of the modem not being removable.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. It is believed that no extensions of time or fees are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), and any fees required (including fees for net addition of claims) are hereby authorized to be charged to Hewlett-Packard Development Company's Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

Respectfully submitted,



Jonathan M. Harris
PTO Reg. No. 44,144
CONLEY ROSE, P.C.
(713) 238-8000 (Phone)
(713) 238-8008 (Fax)
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
Legal Dept., M/S 35
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400